REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending, of which claims 1, 6, 12, 21 and 22 are independent. In the Office Action mailed August 12, 2005, claims 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph), claims 1-10 and 12-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and request favorable reconsideration.

As set forth, Applicants have amended claims 2, 7 and 13 and canceled claim 19 in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In addition, Applicants have withdrawn claim 11, as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Further, Applicants have added new claims 21-25.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-10 and 12-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kracht, U.S. Patent No. 6,516,345. To anticipate a claim, each and every element set forth in the claim must be found in a single reference. (MPEP § 2131). Further, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ... claims." (MPEP § 2131). Applicants submit that Kracht does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as contained within any of claims 1, 6 or 12, and thus does not anticipate claims 1-10 and 12-19. For instance, Applicants submit that Kracht does not teach "[a] method of discovery and display of one or more phones on a computer network," including "discovering a phone by means of a first protocol," "using discovered information to insert an icon representing the phone in the relevant position in a display of the topology of the network," and "discovering other devices on the network using a different protocol," as in claim 1 and similarly in claim 6 and 12.

Kracht teaches a discovery mechanism to discover known devices by first contacting an Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) agent of each device associated with a network

address to request identification information from the SNMP agent. (Col. 4). If the SNMP agent of a device associated with a network address responds to a SNMP request, the device is discovered by (i) identifying the device type based on the information contained in the response, and (ii) gathering additional information associated with the device using one or more protocols, such as SNMP and/or Cisco Discovery Protocol (CDP). (Col. 7-15). Then, after discovery the identity associated with the known device is used to create a topology of the network. (Col. 15).

The Examiner suggested that Kracht teaches a method of discovering a phone by means of a first protocol and gave a reference to column 6, line 51 to column 7, line 5 and column 18, lines 56-67. The Kracht specification discusses discovering objects on a network. Kracht does not seek to discover phones and to put an icon relating to a phone onto the network. Column 6, line 51 to column 7, line 5 does not refer to a phone at all. The reference to phones is in column 18, but that is only in respect of a means to connect the network to the internet rather than a straight forward phone. In other words, the phone is only used there as a modem connection.

There does not seem to be any consideration in Kracht of discovering a phone in a computer network, and providing an icon on a network map relating to that phone. Furthermore there is no teaching of trying to discover a phone on a network. Kracht is completely silent on the problems of discovering a phone on a network, and using the solutions set out by the present invention as recited in the claims. For example, because phones are unmanaged devices, the telephones will normally appear as generic devices using conventional discovering techniques. (Spec, p. 2, lines 22-23). The present claims recite techniques for discovering phones on a network to solve such a concern. In contrast, Kracht only teaches a discovery mechanism to discover known devices by first contacting an SNMP agent of each device. However, Ethernet phones do not support the SNMP protocol. Thus, discovering the network using SNMP will mean that the Ethernet phones will appear as unmanaged generic devices, in other words, the

SNMP protocol will not allow for proper discovery of those phones. (See Spec, p. 5, lines 5-16).

Further, the Examiner asserted that Kracht teaches using discovered information to insert an icon representing the phone in the relevant position in a display of the topology of the network, and gave a reference to column 6, line 51 to column 7, line 5. This cited section does not discuss whatsoever anything regarding inserting an icon representing a phone within a display of a network. This cited section discusses SNMP community strings.

Furthermore, Kracht does not even mention HTTP, as in claims 2, 7 and 13. Thus, since Kracht does not teach all limitations of any of claims 1, 6 or 12, Kracht does not anticipate claims 1-10 and 12-19.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kracht. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under § 103 the cited references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP § 2142). Kracht does not teach all of the limitations of claim 1, from which claim 20 depends, as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectively submit that, in view of the remarks above, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request such action. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3331 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: 10/12/05   By: _____

Thomas E. Wettermann
Reg. No. 41,523